UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/647,755	08/25/2003	Hervon Porter	KYE-001	2783

36822 7590 08/01/2007		EXAMINER
GORDON & JACOBSON, P.C.		MADAMBA, CLIFFORD B
60 LONG RIDGE ROAD		
SUITE 407	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
STAMFORD, CT 06902	3609	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 August 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date *January 22, 2004*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

Detailed Action

1.   This action is in reply to Application 10/647,755 filed on August 25, 2003.

2.   Claims **1-25** are currently pending and have been examined.

Information Disclosure Statement

3.   The Information Disclosure Statement filed on January 22, 2004 has been considered. An

initialed copy of the Form 1449 is enclosed herewith.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis

for the rejections under this section made in this office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a
>
> printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a
>
> patent.

5.   Claims **1-7, 9-10, 12, 15-18, 20-21** and **23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being

anticipated by Ludwig et al, U.S. Pub 2003/0004874.

6.   With regard to claim **1**, Ludwig teaches *a system for electronic presentment of bills and invoices related to goods and/or services provided by a first entity to a second entity comprising:*

- *first means for authenticating at least one first-entity-class user that is associated with at least one first entity* (see at least paragraph 31, lines 4-8);
- *second means for authenticating at least one second-entity-class user that is associated with at least one second entity* (see at least paragraph 31, lines 4-8);
- *an application server* (see at least paragraph 5, lines 5-10; paragraph 38, lines 1-8);
- *a first application component, operably coupled to said first means, that interacts in real-time over a network with an authenticated first-entity-class user to enter, create, maintain, and store billing information and related invoices pertaining to at least one second entity* (see at least 106, lines 1-12);
- *a second application component, operably coupled to said second means, that interacts in real-time over the network with an authenticated second-entity-class user to access portions of said billing information and related invoices pertaining to the authenticated second-entity-class user* (see at least paragraph 109, lines 7-19, 23-24).

7.   With regard to claim **2**, Ludwig teaches the limitation of claim 1 as described above. Ludwig further teaches *the system wherein: said first application component and said second application component operate in conjunction with data security logic to selectively control second-entity-class user access to portions of said billing information and related invoices that pertain to an authenticated second-entity-class user* (see at least paragraph 59, lines 1-5).

8.   With regard to claim **3**, Ludwig teaches the limitation of claim 1 as described above. Ludwig further teaches *the system wherein: said first application component and said second application component operate in conjunction with data security logic to selectively control*

first-entity-class user access to portions of said billing information and related invoices that pertain to an authenticated first-entity-class user (see at least paragraph 59, lines 1-5).

9.   With regard to claim **4**, Ludwig teaches the limitation of claim 1 as described above. Ludwig further teaches *the system of claim 1, wherein: said first means and said second means comprise a web server that operates in a demilitarized zone and that communicates with at least one component of said application server via secure communications through a firewall routing device* (see at least paragraph 29, lines 1-4; paragraph 30, lines 1-5).

10.   With regard to claim **5**, Ludwig teaches the limitation of claim 1 as described above. Ludwig further teaches *the system wherein: first-entity-class users are logically partitioned into at least two different types each performing functions as part of an invoicing process, and said first application component includes logic modules corresponding to the different types of first-entity-class users, said logic modules interacting with corresponding types of browser-based first-entity-class users to perform said functions as part of the invoicing process* (see at least paragraph 57, lines 1-5).

11.   With regard to claim **6**, Ludwig teaches the limitation of claim 1 as described above. Ludwig further teaches *the system wherein: second-entity-class users are logically partitioned into at least two different types each performing functions as part of an invoicing process, and said second application component includes logic modules corresponding to the different types of second-entity-class users, said logic modules interacting with corresponding types of browser-based second-entity-class users to perform said functions as part of the invoicing process* (see at least paragraph 57, lines 1-5).

12.   With regard to claim **7**, Ludwig teaches the limitation of claim 1 as described above. Ludwig further teaches *the system of claim 1, wherein: said first application component enables access to particular billing information by at least one authenticated second-entity-class user in response to finalization of said particular billing information* (see at least paragraph 109, lines 23-25; paragraph 111, lines 6-8).

13.   With regard to claim **9**, Ludwig teaches the limitation of claim 7 as described above. Ludwig further teaches *the system wherein: said particular billing information cannot be added to an invoice until approved by an authenticated second-entity-class user* (see at least paragraph 130, lines 1-4).

14.   With regard to claim **10**, Ludwig teaches the limitation of claim 1 as described above. Ludwig further teaches *the system wherein: said first application component enables access to particular invoice information by at least one authenticated second-entity-class user in response to posting of said particular invoice information* (see at least paragraph 111, lines 6-8).

15.   With regard to claim **12**, Ludwig teaches the limitation of claim 1 as described above. Ludwig further teaches *the system wherein: at least one of said first application component and said second application component cooperate with messaging logic to provide messages to authenticated users of the system regarding status of billing information and invoice information maintained by the system* (see at least paragraph 124, lines 1-4).

16.   With regard to claim **15**, Ludwig teaches *a method for electronic presentment of bills and invoices related to goods and/or services provided by at least first entity to at least one second entity comprising*:

- *authenticating at least one first-entity-class user that is associated with at least one first entity* (see at least paragraph 31, lines 4-8);

- *interacting in real-time over a network with an authenticated first-entity-class user to enter, create, maintain, and store billing information and related invoices pertaining to at one second entity in a database*(see at least 106, lines 1-12);

- *authenticating at least one second-entity-class user that is associated with a second entity* (see at least paragraph 31, lines 4-8); and,

- *interacting in real-time over the network with an authenticated second-entity-class user to access portions of said billing information and related invoices pertaining to the authenticated second-entity-class user from said database* (see at least paragraph 109, lines 7-19, 23-24).

17.   With regard to claim **16**, Ludwig teaches the limitation of claim 15 as described above. Ludwig further teaches *the method further comprising: selectively controlling second-entity-class user access to portions of said billing information and related invoices that pertain to an authenticated second-entity-class user* (see at least paragraph 59, lines 1-5).

18.   With regard to claim **17**, Ludwig teaches the limitation of claim 15 as described above. Ludwig further teaches *the method of claim 15, wherein: selectively controlling first-entity-class user access to portions of said billing information and related invoices that pertain to an authenticated first-entity-class user* (see at least paragraph 59, lines 1-5).

19.   With regard to claim **18**, Ludwig teaches the limitation of claim 15 as described above. Ludwig further teaches *the method further comprising: enabling access to particular billing information by at least one authenticated second-entity-class user in response to finalization of said particular billing information* (see at least paragraph 109, lines 23-25; paragraph 111, lines 6-8).

20.   With regard to claim **20**, Ludwig teaches the limitation of claim 18 as described above. Ludwig further teaches *the method wherein: said particular billing information cannot be added to an invoice until approved by an authenticated second-entity-class user* (see at least paragraph 130, lines 1-4).

21.   With regard to claim **21**, Ludwig teaches the limitation of claim 15 as described above. Ludwig further teaches *the method further comprising: enabling access to particular invoice information by at least one authenticated second-entity-class user in response to posting of said particular invoice information* (see at least paragraph 111, lines 6-8).

22.   With regard to claim **23**, Ludwig teaches the limitation of claim 15 as described above. Ludwig further teaches *the method further comprising: automatically generating messages to authenticated users of the system regarding status of billing information and invoice information maintained by the system* (see at least paragraph 124, lines 1-4).

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

23.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office Action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

24.   Claims **8, 11, 13-14, 19, 22** and **24-25** are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludwig et al., U.S. Pub 2003/0004874, in view of Ensel et al., U.S. 6,493,685.

25.   With regards to claim **8**, Ludwig teaches the limitation of claim 7 as described above. Ludwig doesn't explicitly teach *the limitation wherein: the finalization of said particular billing information is accomplished by interaction over the network with an authenticated first-entity-class user*. Ensel, however, discloses wherein billing functions in the preparation of an invoice are carried out over the network by a billing entity (see at least column 13, lines 28-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the limitation above, as taught by Ludwig, with the system/method, as taught by Ensel, for the motivation of carrying out a process for creating an electronic bill or invoice (see Ensel, column 13, line 1-2).

26.   With regards to claim **11**, Ludwig teaches the limitation of claim 10 as described above. Ludwig doesn't explicitly teach *the limitation wherein: the posting of said particular billing information is accomplished by interaction over the network with an authenticated first-entity-class user*. Ensel, however, discloses wherein billing functions in the preparation of an invoice are carried out over the network by a billing entity (see at least column 13, lines 28-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the limitation above, as taught by Ludwig, with the system/method, as taught by Ensel, for the motivation of carrying out a process for creating an electronic bill or invoice (see Ensel, column 13, line 1-2).

27.   With regards to claim **13**, Ludwig teaches the limitation of claim 1 as described above. Ludwig doesn't explicitly teach *the system wherein: at least one of said first application component and said second application component interact in real-time over the network with authenticated users to define at least one project, wherein each given project pertains to a*

specific second entity and specifies rules and conditions associated with an invoicing process carried out with respect to given project. Ensel, however, discloses an enrollment database containing all information relevant to customers of the biller including billing rules and conditions (see at least column 10, lines 21-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the limitation above, as taught by Ludwig, with the system/method, as taught by Ensel, for the motivation of customizing invoices presented to its customers (see Ensel, column 11, lines 2-5).

28.   With regards to claim **14**, Ludwig teaches the limitation of claim 13 as described above. Ludwig doesn't explicitly teach *the system wherein: each given project includes at least one of a name, time period for the project, information pertaining to the recurring nature of the time period, information regarding time-based billing for the project, and an indication that billing entries associated with the given project can be added to an invoice without prior approval by an authenticated second-entity-class user.* Ensel, however, discloses an enrollment database containing all information relevant to customers of the biller including billing rules and conditions (see at least column 10, lines 21-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the limitation above, as taught by Ludwig, with the system/method, as taught by Ensel, for the motivation of customizing invoices presented to its customers (see Ensel, column 11, lines 2-5).

29.   With regards to claim **19**, Ludwig teaches the limitation of claim 18 as described above. Ludwig doesn't explicitly teach *the limitation wherein: the finalization of said particular billing information is accomplished by interaction over the network with an authenticated first-entity-class user.* Ensel, however, discloses wherein billing functions in the preparation of an invoice are carried out over the network by a billing entity (see at least column 13, lines 28-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the limitation above, as taught by Ludwig, with the system/method, as

taught by Ensel, for the motivation of carrying out a process for creating an electronic bill or invoice (see Ensel, column 13, line 1-2).

30.   With regards to claim **22**, Ludwig teaches the limitation of claim 21 as described above. Ludwig doesn't explicitly teach *the method wherein: the posting of said particular invoice information is accomplished by interaction over the network with an authenticated first-entity-class user.* Ensel, however, *discloses wherein billing functions in the preparation of an invoice are carried out over the network by a billing entity* (see at least column 13, lines 28-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the limitation above, as taught by Ludwig, with the system/method, as taught by Ensel, for the motivation of carrying out a process for creating an electronic bill or invoice (see Ensel, column 13, line 1-2).

31.   With regards to claim **24**, Ludwig teaches the limitation of claim 15 as described above. Ludwig doesn't explicitly teach *the method wherein: interacting in real-time over the network with authenticated users to define at least one project, wherein each given project pertains to a specific client and specifies rules and conditions associated with the invoicing process carried out with respect to given project.* Ensel, however, discloses an enrollment database containing all information relevant to customers of the biller including billing rules and conditions (see at least column 10, lines 21-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the limitation above, as taught by Ludwig, with the system/method, as taught by Ensel, for the motivation of customizing invoices presented to its customers (see Ensel, column 11, lines 2-5).

32.   With regards to claim **25**, Ludwig teaches the limitation of claim 24 as described above. Ludwig doesn't explicitly teach *the method wherein: each given project includes at least one of a name, time period for the project, information pertaining to the recurring nature of the time period, information regarding time-based billing for the project, and an indication that billing*

entries associated with the given project can be added to an invoice without prior approval by

an authenticated second-entity-class user. Ensel, however, discloses an enrollment database

containing all information relevant to customers of the biller including billing rules and

conditions (see at least column 10, lines 21-49). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the limitation

above, as taught by Ludwig, with the system/method, as taught by Ensel, for the motivation

of customizing invoices presented to its customers (see Ensel, column 11, lines 2-5).

Conclusion

33.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's

disclosure.

- Ganesan et al., U.S. 6,856,974, teaches an electronic bill presentment technique with

  enhanced biller control.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Clifford Madamba whose telephone number is 571-270-1239. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu 7:30-5:00 EST Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James A. Reagan can be reached 571-272-6710. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Clifford Madamba
Patent Examiner
July 20, 2007

JAMES REAGAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER